

REMARKS

Claim 5, as amended, remains herein. Claim 7 has been added. Claims 1-4 and 6 have been cancelled.

Applicants thank the Examiner for discussing the application with applicants' representative by telephone on January 15, 2008. At that time, the Examiner stated that if the prior art references failed to disclose that the substrate holders without the MgO coating must be in the evaporation room simultaneously with coated substrate holders, claim 5 would be allowable over the presently cited prior art. For the reasons stated below, claim 5 is allowable over such prior art.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yasui et al. JP 2002-056773A in view of Hirata et al. JP 04-365349 and Kawakusu JP 2001-316797. The Office Action admits that Yasui fails to disclose repeatedly using a plurality of substrate holders, such that when a MgO film is formed on a substrate, at least one substrate holder in the evaporating room is coated with MgO film from forming the MgO film on the substrate, and at least one holder in the evaporating room comprises elements not coated with said MgO film.

Neither Hirata nor Kawakusu supplies what Yasui lacks. Hirata discloses a system that measures the thickness of film deposited on substrate carriers and regularly cleans the substrate carriers. Hirata fails to disclose that when the MgO film is formed on a substrate, at least one substrate holder in the evaporating room is coated with MgO film from forming the MgO film on the substrate, and at least one holder in the evaporating room comprises elements not coated with said MgO film.

Kawakusu discloses using shields to prevent film from forming on substrate carriers. Kawakusu fails to disclose that when a MgO film is formed on a substrate, at least one substrate holder in the evaporating room is coated with MgO film from forming MgO film on

the substrate, and at least one holder in the evaporating room comprises elements not coated with said MgO film.

Thus, none of Yasui, Hirata, and Kawakusu, alone or combined, discloses every element of applicants' claim 5. Nor do Yasui, Hirata, and Kawakusu contain any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them to render obvious applicants' claim 5. Yasui, Hirata, and Kawakusu involve depositing MgO film, preventing excessive film build-up and protecting a substrate, respectively. Applicants invention does not involve cleaning substrate holders, per se, rather it combines filmed and non-filmed substrate holders in an evaporating room to keep a more constant gas concentration, which improves manufacturing characteristics. If substrate holders are all cleaned when they become coated with a certain level of film, the gas concentration in the evaporating room will be significantly less when the "clean" batch is used than it was when the "dirty," or film-coated batch, is used. This causes substrate characteristics to vary significantly from the dirty batch to the clean batch, which makes manufacturing devices with the substrates more difficult. Applicants' claims 5 and 7 disclose having some cleaned and some uncleaned substrate holders in the evaporation room at all times, so that the substrate characteristics will not vary significantly from one batch to the next. None of Hirata nor Kawakusu, nor anything else in this record, provides any motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement such a system.

Since Yasui, Hirata, and Kawakusu fail to disclose every element of applicants' claim 5; and since none of Yasui, Hirata, Kawakusu, or any other prior art of record, contains any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them to render obvious applicants' claim 5, Yasui, Hirata, and Kawakusu are inadequate grounds for rejection of applicants' claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Accordingly, claim 5 is now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. New claim 7 contains the same limitation that substrate holders with a film coating and substrate holders without a film coating be present in the evaporation room simultaneously in the film-depositing step. Thus, new claim 7 is likewise in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: March 14, 2008



Roger W. Parkhurst

Reg. No. 25,177

Adam C. Ellsworth

Reg. No. 55,152

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.2182

RWP/ACE/cd